

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA
Peperiksaan Semester Kedua

Sidang 1986/87

HMP 404 - Terjemahan dan Penyuntingan

Tarikh: 10 April 1987

Masa: 2.45 ptg. - 5.45 ptg.
(3 jam)

Jawab SEMUA soalan.

1. Huraikan langkah-langkah yang berlaku di dalam proses penterjemahan menurut teori Catford. (30 minit)
2. Huraikan jenis-jenis persamaan yang boleh diberi kepada kata-kata bahasa Inggeris yang diterjemahkan ke dalam bahasa Malaysia. Sertakan contoh-contoh bagi setiap jenis persamaan tersebut untuk menjelaskan jawapan anda. (30 minit)
3. Terjemahkan petikan karangan berikut. Setiap calon disediakan satu petikan khas. Lihat Angka Giliran yang disediakan dan buat petikan yang dikhaskan untuk anda saja. (120 minit)

PETIKAN 1 (Untuk calon Angka Giliran 5725 dan 8197)

Language is a part of culture, it is a part of human behaviour. Language is an acquired habit of systematic vocal activity representing meanings coming from human experiences. One can also say, simply, that language is an acquired vocal system for communicating meanings. This statement tells us

- (a) that language operates in a regular and systematic fashion,
- (b) that language is basically oral, and that the oral symbols represent meaning as they are related to real life situations and experiences, and
- (c) that language has a social function, and that without it society would probably not exist.

.../2

Since language is a part of culture and also a part of human behaviour, our attitude towards it must not be different from that towards any other part of culture or human behaviour.

Any act in our social life - such as the kind of clothes we wear, the table manners we use, the subjects we talk about, and so on - would be either correct or incorrect depending on the situation in which the act is performed. An evening function may require a special kind of dress; a dinner invitation may require a different table setting; and the subjects for discussion will vary in business meetings or friendly gatherings. Such too is the case with language.

The development of London English as the Standard Dialect in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was due basically to the importance of London as the centre of major activities - social, economic, educational, and political. People in different parts of England, wanting to be like the people in important positions, learned London English, sometimes very much as a second language or dialect. In the United States of America a standard dialect developed in much the same way as in England. And today any person growing up in an area that uses a different dialect learns Standard American English, also very much as a second language or dialect.

There are many 'Englishes' in the world as there are native speakers of English; and Standard English in England and in the United States of America is made up of the common features of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar as they are used by educated people in important positions. Standard English changes to the extent that these people change the common features of their speech.

It is *not* the way we think those people *ought* to speak that determines the Standard dialect; it is, rather, the way they actually *do* speak that determines it.

What is correct or incorrect in a language at any given time is determined only on the basis of how educated people in important positions actually *use* the language.

Language, as a system, operates in set patterns. These patterns exist on three closely related levels - phonology, vocabulary and grammar.

Phonology. The features of sound in a language are systematically structured. They are divided into two main branches:

- (a) the branch of segmental features including consonants and vowels, and
- (b) the branch of supra-segmental features including stress, intonation, pause, juncture, and rhythm.

.../3

Vocabulary. The vocabulary of a language consists of the lexical forms (words) that refer to parts of our experience. In English, these words consist of consonants and vowels arranged in specific sequences.

Grammar. Grammar consists of the means by which relationships between words are shown. These relationships also come from our experiences. The means by which relationships are shown include:

- (a) inflection which is the changes in the forms of words (such as *cat: cats, like: liked, big: bigger* etc.)
- (b) word order which is the arrangement of words in relation to each other (as in *He is here./Is he here?* and
- (c) grammatical words, which in themselves signal grammatical relationships without having any lexical meaning (such as *shall, could, of, at, etc.*). The features of grammar, like the features of sound, are systematically structured in patterns.

PETIKAN 2 (Untuk calon Angka Giliran 5732 dan 8196)

General linguistics means the science of language. As with other branches of knowledge and scientific study, linguistics must be studied in two ways: (1) in relation to other sciences outside itself, and (2) in the different branches within itself. At the beginning something must be said under both these subjects, but it should be made clear that in these, as in several other important subjects, the opinions of scientists differ in quite considerable ways.

It must also be realized that a subject like general linguistics, in common with most other subjects, is changing. Opinions, including some important ones, may change or receive different degrees of attention in the course of years. No book can honestly pretend to deal with the subject in a way that will both be accepted in all respects by every recognized scientist in the field and remain unchanged for all time.

Let us first consider the difference between general linguistics as the science or scientific study of language and the study of individual languages. This latter study is, indeed, more familiar to the majority of people, and has played a major part in all stages of education in many

.../4

parts of the world for sometime; the study of linguistics, on the other hand, is, at least in its present form, a relatively new field of study, though in the present century it has shown marked growth in the numbers of its students and teachers in the universities of Great Britain, Europe, the United States, the USSR. and several of the newly developing countries of the rest of the world.

General linguistics is concerned with human language as a universal and recognizable part of human behaviour and of the human abilities; it is perhaps one of the most essential to human life as we know it; it is also one of the human capabilities with the greatest influence on all mankind's activities and success. There is no 'general language' as the specific subject-matter of linguistics other than and apart from the numerous and so far uncounted different languages (estimated at around 3,000) spoken in the world; but the general linguist, in the sense of the scientist or the student concerned with general linguistics, does not as such deal with any one or more of them to a greater extent than with any others. As an ideal he would know something about every language; this is, of course, impossible, and in practice most linguists deal with a limited number of languages including their own native language; the number of languages studied, and the depth of knowledge acquired of each, varies by personal factors from one linguist to another. Thus it has been pointed out that the meaning of the world linguist as a scientist must be distinguished from the sense of the world linguist as often used by the public, to refer to someone who has a practical knowledge and command of a number of foreign languages. It is, of course, good for the linguist to know quite a lot about some languages and the more languages (especially those representing types different from his own and from each other) with which he has some acquaintance, the better he is able to deal with his subject.

Language in all its forms (that is all the languages of the world and all the different uses to which in the various circumstances of mankind they are put) makes up the field of the linguist. He seeks a scientific understanding of the place of language in human life, and of the ways in which it is organized to answer the needs it serves and the functions it performs. Several of the subjects he has within his field and several of the questions to which he seeks answers represent divisions of the study of foreign languages as well as the study of one's own language. Pronunciation (phonetics) and grammar are familiar enough, and some study of meaning and of the way in which meanings are discovered and states is assumed in the writing and use of any dictionary or vocabulary book.

It is well to reflect on the various languages of the world. Here one may notice that language, and linguistics (the science of language) cover living languages, that is languages still used today as means of communication, and dead languages, that is languages like Ancient Greek or Old English (Anglo-Saxon) now no more spoken but known from written records. Among the living languages the linguist finds some of his material in the languages of world-wide use and with long literary traditions; he also finds some of his material in unwritten languages, unknown outside their own community, except to the linguist, and (as is the position of many North and South American tongues) spoken perhaps by less than a hundred speakers; some of these languages are of course in danger of going out of existence.

PETIKAN 3 (Untuk calon Angka Giliran 5737 dan 6712)

Science may be understood in two ways in relation to language. First, it refers to the fact that the study of language is considered worthy of learned attention; it also means that a regular body of facts and theory is built up around it. Secondly, it indicates the attitude taken by the linguist today towards his subject; in this perhaps it marks a definite characteristic of twentieth-century linguistics.

In saying that linguistics is a science, one is saying

- (a) that it deals with a particular body of material: spoken and written language;
- (b) that it proceeds by operations that can be made known and described; and
- (c) that the body of facts it discovers can be justified by referring them to principles and to a theory that can be stated. The purpose of linguistics is to examine the material and to make general statements about its various elements that relate to regular rules. In its operations and statements it is guided by three principles of science:
 - i. that the material should be complete;
 - ii. that the material should show agreement between its different parts; and
 - iii. that the statements about the material should be brief; a shorter statement is to be preferred to a longer one.

.../6

One can make the position of linguistics within the sciences more exact. It is a practical science, in that the material it deals with can be observed with the senses: speech can be heard; the movement of the voice organs can be seen directly or with the aid of instruments; and writing can be seen and read. Within the practical sciences, linguistics is one of the social sciences because language is part of the actions of men and women in society. Of course it is true a person can use language alone and without being in contact with others, but the essential use of language, for most people, involves two or more persons in a social situation.

While the essential subject here is linguistics as a science, it would still be in place to refer to what is known as *intuition*, which is the ability to know and understand without reasoning. People differ in their ability to understand languages, examine meanings, explain how sentences are constructed, and know how words are said and used. It is often said that a good deal of what goes on under the name of language learning makes use of intuition or a feeling for the language, such as is possessed by native speakers and is acquired by those who have been familiar with a language for a very long time. In linguistic descriptions, appeal has been made to native speaker's intuition in approving or refusing certain matters related to his language. Progress in any branch of knowledge must, at least at first, depend on the intuition of some individual. The use of intuition in scientific studies is accepted as part of the equipment of the scientist, but not as a way of proof or appeal. The intuition of native speakers - as well as guesses of the linguist - must in the end be examined and supported by statements about the forms of what is spoken and heard, written and read; this way they become no more the private feelings of individuals, but the public property of anyone able and willing to follow through the scientific study involved. In other words, 'intuition is personal; science requires that its methods be public, and that its results be checked'.

There is a false statement that has been made as a result of saying that linguistics is a science, and it must be corrected at once. This is that because linguistics is a science, it is necessarily not one of the humanities, and that as a result linguistics is in some way against the study of literature. It should be made clear at once that nothing in linguistic science is against literature. Indeed the opposite may be true, and if a linguist finds himself not enjoying the music of a poem, the power of a speech, or the flow of a story, he has only himself, and not his subject, to blame.

In the present educational situation, some people have expressed concern about the distance that has widened between what are loosely called the arts and sciences. In any attempt to bring these two closer together, linguistics, along with some of the other fields of study devoted to the ways of mankind, may have an important part to play. Indeed among all branches of knowledge, linguistics is in a special position. Science, like all other publicly shared knowledge, demands the use of language to talk about its particular subject. Linguistics differs from other studies in that it both uses language and has language as its subject. Linguistics has, for this reason, been described as language turned back on itself, or as language about language; and since every branch of knowledge makes use of language, linguistics may, in some ways, be said to be at the centre of them all, as being the study of the tool that they most use.

PETIKAN 4 (Untuk calon Angka Giliran 5817 dan 6040)

One topic connected with the study of language that the general public has shown great interest in is the question of the origin of language. There has been a good deal of theory on this, usually taking the form of trying to find out how languages developed from different ways of noise-making. Several guesses have been made and different proofs given. Among these are the following: imitation calls in answer to animal noises, cries resulting from strong emotion, and calls for help. Linguists, however, tend to leave this sort of theory alone, not because of any lack of interest, but because it lies far beyond the reaches of scientific work. Language as a human activity is much older than the earliest languages studies (some 4,000 years old). Writing, by which alone presently unused languages are known to us, is, as compared with speech, a very recent introduction; it is the product of settled and developed civilization. In relation to the origin of language, every known language is very recent.

Two frequently used explanations for the origin of language are how children acquire speech and the structures and characteristics of so-called 'primitive' languages. Both cannot be used for this purpose. Children acquire their native language in a situation in which language is already established and in constant use all around them for the satisfaction of needs. Even if they are not actually 'taught' to speak, as most are, their situation is entirely different from that of mankind as a whole in the circumstances assumed to obtain while language itself was taking shape.

The second argument, based on the nature of 'primitive' languages, rests on a common, though wrong, idea about these languages. Linguistically, there are no primitive languages. There are languages of peoples whose cultures may be called primitive. Primitive, however, is not a proper description of language. Studies of the languages of the world do not show that structurally the languages of people at different levels of development are different. Their vocabularies, of course, at any time reflect quite closely the state of the material and philosophical culture of the speakers: but languages are capable of changing to meet the circumstances of cultural development, and their phonetic and grammatical organization may remain the same during such changes. Linguistic studies have shown that the languages of culturally primitive peoples are phonetically and grammatically no less (and no more) systematic and orderly than the languages of western Europe and of the major world civilizations. Nor are the processes of changes, that affect all parts of languages, any less active or any slower in operation in these languages than in others; indeed, the opposite may be the case, as it has been held that the establishment of writing systems and standards of correctness tend, if anything, to slow linguistic changes in certain situations.

What can usefully be done is to compare human language and its place in human life with the most language-like communication systems observed in the animal kingdom. Several such systems, more significant than just cries, have been studied in their relations to human speech, sepecially bee dancing. In the dance system of bees, some bees that have located a source of food can indicate its distance and direction by a set of movements made by them upon their return home. The 'substance' of this form of communication is quite other than that of human speech, but in certain respects it comes closer to it.

For all the interest to the linguist that behaviour systems of this sort have, the distance that separates them from language is very wide. In particular one must notice how difficult human speech is and how it is able to handle the entire range of human experience.

Human speech is passed from generation to generation by a process of learning on the part of children, often with teaching by their parents or others. It is not instinctive or inherited, though, of course, the physiological and neurological capacity for speech is. This passing through generations causes linguistic change, the material of historical linguistics. There is no reason to suppose that animal cries or bee dances change to anything as is the case with human languages.

Human progress is greatly speeded by the use of language; the knowledge and experience acquired by one person can be passed on to another in language, so that in part he starts where the other leaves off. In this connection, the invention of printing is very important. At the present time any work done by anyone in any part of the world can be known (by translation if necessary) by anyone else able to read and capable of understanding. From these uses of language, spoken and written, the most developed animal communication system, though given the title of language, is worlds away.

PETIKAN 5 (Untuk calon Angka Giliran 5859 dan 6010)

Linguists have found by experience that there are several characteristics of language that provide a basis for correct description. The first is that all languages are *sound*. Second, all languages are *systematic*. Third, language is *meaningful*, since the sounds speakers make are connected with factors other than language itself. When the relation between the sounds the speakers make and their meanings is studied, we find that the relation is both *arbitrary* and *conventional*.

The statement that language is sound may appear natural, since the most common experience all men have of language is in speaking and listening to it. But this statement is meant to point out that the sounds of language come before, and are more important than, their representation in writing. While the writing systems of languages have their systematic features, the linguist considers writing and other methods of representing language second in importance to speech. All writing systems represent only part of the important signals given in speech, and the letters used in common alphabets, such as the familiar Roman alphabet, represent different sounds in different languages.

By regarding language basically as sound, the linguist can take advantage of the fact that all human beings produce speech sound with essentially the same equipment. While the sounds of foreign languages may sound strange or difficult to us, all of them can be described by accounting for the movements of the articulatory organs that produce them.

Language can be represented by a string of symbols. An examination of many languages will show that the number of symbols required will not be unlimited. A few as a dozen may be enough, while perhaps fifty or more may be required. But whatever the number of symbols, not all possible combinations of sounds (and, therefore, of symbols) will occur. This illustrates part of what is meant by saying that language is *systematic*: it can be described in terms of a limited number of units that can combine only in a limited number of ways.

A simple illustration can be seen in a few English words: *table* is a common word with a sequence of sound that makes us recognize it as an English word, and so is *stable*. To each of these words we can suffix another single sound, to give *stables* and *tables*, both of which are acceptable English words. But there is not a single sound in English that we could prefix to *stable* that would give us a correct sequence in English, nor is there a single sound or combination of sounds that we could suffix to *tables* or *stables* to result in a correct English word.

Speakers of English would probably discuss the examples of *table* and *stable* and their accepted forms in terms of two kinds of reasoning. For example, they might say that there is no such word as *stable* and that it is not grammatical to put another suffix after the -s of *stables*. Another way of putting this is to say that languages have both a phonological (or sound) system and a grammatical system, each with its proper units and rules of acceptable combination and order. Units are not permitted to combine for several reasons, phonological, grammatical, stylistic, or semantic. Language is a system of systems, all of which operate at the same time, but we can distinguish, for the sake of analysis, the units and combination rules proper to each.

The reason the linguist, or anyone else, is interested in studying language is that the sounds produced in speech are connected with almost every fact of human life and communication. There is a relation between the kinds of sounds speakers of various language make and their cultural setting. It is basically through the learning of language that the child becomes an active member of the community, and the leaders in a society preserve and advance their leadership largely through their ability to communicate with people through language.

PETIKAN 6 (Untuk calon Angka Giliran 5880 dan 6005)

Communication through speech alone between speakers of different languages is possible because there is no necessary connection between the sounds that each language uses and the message that is expressed, even if the message in both languages is the same. When we say that language is *arbitrary* we are simply pointing out the condition required for the existence of more than one language: that there be no direct, necessary connection between the nature of the things or ideas language deals with and the linguistic units or combinations by which these things or ideas are expressed. This statement is clear enough when we consider that there are different expressions for *baby* or *infant* in English, and that other languages use quite different-sounding words to express the same thing - for example, German *Kind*, Spanish *criatura*, Turkish *cojuk*. If there had to be a direct connection between the nature of the things languages talk about and the expressions used to represent them, there could only be one language.

If it is true that there is no connection between the things that language deals with and the expressions we use to represent these things, it would appear that there is nothing that we would know in advance about language at all. This is certainly not true, since people use language according to fixed rules. It is only when we consider an item of language by itself that we see how arbitrary it is; but no linguistic unit really exists alone. It is part of a system of systems, with regular relations to the other units of the language. In fact, the use of and formation of linguistic units is so regular that these units almost seem to be used according to an agreement among the speakers.

Language, therefore, can be said to be *conventional* as a consequence of this apparent agreement. This agreement is not, nor could it be, stated; rather, it is an agreement or fact, of action. Speakers in a given community, for example, use the same sorts of expressions to name the same things, and the same sorts of constructions to deal with similar situations. It is this convention that makes up and fixes linguistic systems. An important result of the conventional nature of language is that we can be sure that a correct description of the speech of a single representative speaker will apply to the speech habits of others in the same community.

One reason why a description of a single speaker's habits can represent the speech of a community is that language is a system of differences to be observed. How these differences are made is not very important. For example, parakeets cannot produce sounds exactly like human speakers because they do not have the vocal cords or nasal cavities

.../12

that men have. Yet the sounds that they produce differ from each other in a manner similar to speech sounds and are understood to represent human speech. Individuals do not and cannot speak exactly like each other; they speak alike, and in the same language, when they make the same number of phonetic and grammatical distinctions as other speakers.

Language can be understood as a system of patterns and a system of contrasts. Each pattern can be represented by an unlimited number of utterances. Each utterance can differ completely in reference from other utterances. This patterning is the basis for our ability to produce new sentences or to understand sentences we hear for the first time. By using the phonological, grammatical, and lexical systems in a creative way, poets and writers or speakers can make us more aware of possible relations among things. In this way they may be said to create a new world for us through language.

Apart from the clear cases of historically related languages, such as the Romance group (which includes French and Spanish), it is not surprising that all languages have certain features in common. All speakers experience the material world about them with the same senses and in basically the same way. The differences in the phonological, grammatical, and lexical systems mentioned above reflect the social organization of speech. While this arbitrary selection of important features of experience makes learning languages that are unrelated to one's own difficult, there are still many similarities to be found among different languages. That is why languages can be learned.

PETIKAN 7 (Untuk calon Angka Giliran 5887 dan 5992)

Most of use speak quite differently when we speak to different people; to a child, to a friend, or to a superior at work. With some we feel at ease, with others serious; some are acquaintances, others are strangers or near-strangers. We even speak differently to the same person when we meet him in different circumstances; at work we use the language of the office, at a game we use the different, every day language of the club-house. And two people talking to a third in similar terms and circumstances will nevertheless each have a quite different way of speaking. Even a 'Hullo' on the telephone is often enough to make known the speaker to us. Our speech, and in many ways, our

use of speech is as individual to us as our handwriting. Yet even within our own *idiolect* - our own individual speech habits - many of us have command of a range of different types of language.

Apart from the value we attach to what is said or written, we tend to judge the quality of people and situations from the way language is used, and often our later actions and attitudes are determined by such judgements. What is it that causes people to use language in any particular way, and what is it that distinguishes such 'fashions of speaking' one from another? What is it about their use of language that influences us in our judgement of people?

The reasons for such differences, and for our judgement of them, are many and difficult, but it is perhaps possible to mention some of the linguistic factors and examine them. Other factors such as hand movements, tone of voice, and attitude are of importance, but must here be left aside. Matters which we can analyze may include:

- (a) The regional or social dialect of the speaker. This tells us where he comes from and what we judge to be his position in the community. This dialect may be a question of different words, or uses of words, different grammatical structures, or different pronunciation. Where pronunciation only is concerned, the differences are usually referred to as differences of accent.
- (b) The 'correctness' or incorrectness of his vocabulary and grammar.
- (c) the 'level' of his vocabulary and grammar.
- (d) The choice he makes of vocabulary and structure in relation to what he is saying.

Regional and 'social' dialects play a much more important role in English society than in some others. It was Bernard Shaw who said that it was 'impossible for an Englishman to open his mouth without making some other Englishman dislike him', and although this is less true now than it used to be, there is still much truth in it. Many of the older generation, particularly those who have never moved far from their native areas, tend to dislike and even not to trust people who 'speak differently'. This feeling grows when there is a lack of understanding between speakers of broad and differing dialects. The younger generation brought up to use the local speech, sometimes feel so badly about such local speech habits that they tend to try to change their speech nearer to what they feel is a more acceptable form, though in certain areas of society this situation is not changing.

It is necessary at this stage to explain what is meant by 'standard'. The terms *Standard English* and *Received Pronunciation* are generally used to indicate a way of using English which agrees with the natural or acquired habits of educated people whose speech gives no indication of their regional past. Neither Standard English nor Received Pronunciation (R.P.) can have any absolute values; since every individual speaker of a language uses that language in a way that is original to himself, even within Standard, or R.P., there are enough variations to enable us to tell an individual from his speech, or even his writing. There is, nevertheless, a certain body of similar usage which marks the speech of numbers of educated people as alike, and which is referred to as Received Pronunciation (in reference to speech sounds) and Standard English (in reference to word usage and grammatical forms).

PETIKAN 8 (Untuk calon Angka Giliran 5921 dan 5987)

However, it must be realized that this kind of English is itself a dialect; in origin it is the dialect of the upper classes of south-east England; or more particularly of the London area. Over the last few hundred years it has gradually spread outwards from this region, and downwards in the social scale, so that it no longer has a regional or social connection but it is nevertheless still only a dialect which has been to some extent unnaturally encouraged. A fact not always realized, moreover, is that this Standard English is spoken today only by a very small minority of the world's English speakers, and that in addition to what we might call Standard British English, there are also dialects which can be, and sometimes are, given such names as Standard Jamaican English, Standard South African English, and so on. Such other 'Englishes' move out to a greater or lesser extent from Standard British English; at the extremes there may be problems of understanding between, say, a Nigerian English speaker and an Indian English speaker, especially if such speakers have any special forms of speech over and above national variations.

A linguist will not regard R.P. or Standard British English as 'better' in any respect than any other regional or national dialect; it is simply another dialect requiring description and analysis in the same way as any other, though its peculiar social and educational position may cause it to be studied more often and in greater depth than

other English dialects. The question of 'better' or 'good' speech generally, is a social, and not a linguistic question. Most people in Great Britain do, however, recognize Standard English and to a lesser extent. Received Pronunciation, as linguistic models on which to base the teaching of English, and these models are also commonly used in the teaching of English abroad, at least in those countries which have had close connections with Great Britain.

Social judgements of 'good' or 'better' speech are usually based on what is thought to be the linguistic idea of 'correctness'. You will often be told that such-and-such a form is 'correct'. If asked to state on what basis it is 'correct', people tend to say, 'It *is* correct; that's what English is like.' There is a general feeling that somewhere, somehow, there is a body of knowledge which lays down rules for 'correct' English. In fact, of course, no such body exists, and attempts to set up would fail in the face of the great changes which constantly take place in any language. For example, to insist on the 'correct' use of 'whom' in the spoken language is now a mistake, for even the most educated speakers rarely use it. In spite of this, certain forms of language are recognized as linguistic models for English, and grammar books are constantly produced which claim to include these models.

But if linguists reject the idea of absolute standards of 'correctness', it nevertheless remains true that certain forms are considered more suited than others for particular circumstances. As with dialects, the linguist observes and take note of the social judgements, but he does not himself pass such judgements. He observes and records that in certain situations this or that form of speech will be used, and not some other; he will note that the forms of speech will vary according to the speaker, the hearer and the circumstances in which both find themselves. For example, the following statements are made by one person, speaking first to his wife, then to a friend, and then to his superior:

- (a) 'Met that fool John today. Wants his job back - can you imagine?'
- (b) 'Do you remember John Jones? I met him today and he said he'd like his job back. I think he's hopeful, don't you?'
- (c) 'I met Mr. Jones yesterday, sir, who used to work here, if you remember? He asked me to inquire whether his post was still open and whether there was any chance of his taking it up again. I said I would pass the message on, sir.'

Each of these three utterances gives basically the same factual information, but the differing relations of the speaker with his wife, friend, and superior cause him to express the information in rather different language forms. Becoming increasingly more serious in the three sets of circumstances causes him to use different vocabulary and structure.

PETIKAN 9 (Untuk calon Angka Giliran 5922 dan 5956)

In many ways the study of language must be the most important of the social sciences, for it deals with the expression of man's nature, and the tool he uses for his social organization.

One of the greatest difficulties that has faced the study of language has been the need to work with and through language in the analysis of language itself. The methods and the results of this analysis of language have had to be expressed in the language. For this reason modern linguistic analysis has made great use of symbols and mathematical methods, thus avoiding for part of its work the need to prejudge its methods by the structure imposed by language itself.

Like other social sciences, linguistics has needed to make clear its methods and explain its terms of reference. This has been and will continue to be difficult, if not impossible, to the same extent as in other sciences, since intuition must play a large part in linguistic analysis.

Among the fields of linguistic study, the oldest is *philology*. Philology was concerned mainly with an analysis of the development of each language and with the historical relationship of languages in language families. To this end certain 'laws' were discovered, especially the 'laws' of sound-change in the development of Germanic languages. Unlike scientific laws, of course, their application was not universal and they merely stated what had happened. For the most part, however, the study of language was done bit by bit. There are still philological societies and students of philology, but the move towards objective methods in linguistic study has made the philologists of today pursue their work in a different way.

Historical (or *diachronic*) *linguistics* deals with the stages of development of languages. It is closely connected with *comparative linguistics*, which is concerned

with the comparison from one or a number of points of view of two or more languages. Contrastive studies may form part of this work, providing information about the areas of possible interference by the native language of the foreign language learner. These two branches of general linguistics share many of the methods of modern *descriptive linguistics*. The latter has the characteristic of applying a scientific method to the analysis of language. While recognizing the place of intuition, descriptive linguists demand that every statement made about linguistic features be subject to examination and continuing change in the direction of greater correctness and economy.

It is in this respect that general linguistics today differs from the philology of old. Whereas the linguistic scientist will consider his task completed when he has presented the analysis and resulting description, the true philologist would consider it his duty to include judgements of language based on historical or philosophical principles.

Descriptive linguistics is concerned mainly with present-day language. Clearly, such descriptions will be of use to historical linguistics as language changes. Descriptive linguistics normally makes *synchronic* statements about language at one given time as a self-contained system of communication. Historical linguistics makes *diachronic* linguistic statements comparing features of the same language at different points in time. General linguistics, and particularly descriptive linguistics, uses the findings of one or two areas of study which have a separate existence. *Acoustic phonetics* and *physiology* contribute to the study of the production and understanding of the sounds of language, as well as providing information about the possible range of such sounds in human language.

PETIKAN 10 (Untuk calon Angka Giliran 5924 dan 5927)

Semantics is the study of meaning, and since meaning is a characteristic of all sign and symbol systems it obviously has a far wider application than to language. Most linguists at present prefer to contextual description of meaning and these are certainly of more value to the language teacher. Meaning arrived at by intuition may be used as a reference at some stage in a study, but the description itself will work with form. Form is basic to meaning.

A number of related areas of study are grouped under the name of *applied linguistics*. The term was originally used to refer to general linguistics in its application to language teaching. It is still used in this limited sense in the United States although the relationship between a number of fields where the findings of general linguistics have an application is extending the reference of the term.

Within language teaching itself, a number of related areas of study are clearly of great interest. We want to know the connexion of language and thought in the minds of speakers of the *target language*, the language being learned, just as we must know about our students in their relation to their own and the target language. For this information we look to *psycholinguistics*. Very often psycholinguistics has, like *psychology*, been concerned with what is not normal (rather than what is normal) in human language and behaviour. There is much to be done in the study of bilingualism and in those questions of national and racial feelings which are conditioned by and expressed through language.

Any attempt to describe meaning partly in terms of its contextualization, as well as any claim to lead the student into a second 'culture' through language, must depend on an analysis of the foreign society and the social implication of its language. The relationship of language to simple and undeveloped societies has received a great deal of attention in *ethnolinguistic* and *anthropological linguistic* studies. Comparatively little has been done on language in advanced societies. *Sociolinguistics* is coming to take the place of the other terms as more attention is given to the relationship of all languages to their societies and to the establishment of general principles. One serious problem that faces applied linguists is the language problem in developing nations.

Descriptive linguistics may be applied as an aid to literary analysis. It cannot, of course, take the place of the beauty judgement of literature, but linguistics can bring the kind of aid which historical studies offer the critic. *Stylistic* analysis can show the linguistic method used by the author and the extent to which he moved away in practice from the usual linguistic uses of his time.

Automatic translation (or *machine translation*) is concerned with linguistics in its application to the storing of information. Work on automatic translation dates only from 1946 and work on storing information is no older; the design of mechanical computers is rather older. The development of electronic computers, with much larger storing capacities and with much greater speeds, has increased the possibilities in this field.